

dren in proportion to age," suggested continued use of the article, whereas it was a laxative and should not be used continuously.

The Sa-Lax was alleged to be misbranded further in that its label failed to bear such adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions wherein its use might be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or methods or duration of administration, in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users, since the product contained laxative drugs and therefore should not be used when abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, or other symptoms of appendicitis are present; and that frequent or continued use of the article might result in dependence on laxatives.

The Ridia was alleged to be misbranded further under the provisions of the law applicable to foods reported in food notices of judgment.

On November 9, 1942, pleas of nolo contendere having been entered, imposition of sentence was suspended as to both defendants and they were placed on 2 years' probation on each count, to run concurrently.

**911. Adulteration and misbranding of salvaged drugs. U. S. v. 50 Cases of Foods and Drugs. Consent decree of condemnation. Products released under bond for segregation and destruction of unfit portion. (F. D. C. No. 7780. Sample Nos. 59789-E to 59800-E, incl., 78301-E, 78302-E.)**

These products consisted of approximately 2,500 pounds of fire- and water-damaged and otherwise deteriorated salvaged drug store stock, and included, among other things, baby foods, patent medicines, surgical dressings, and vitamin capsules.

On June 23, 1942, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia filed a libel against 50 cases of foods and drugs at Roanoke, Va., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 16, 1942, from Rutherfordton, N. C., by Dobson and Co.; and charging that the drug items were adulterated and misbranded.

The drug items were alleged to be adulterated in that water and smoke had been mixed therewith so as to reduce their quality.

They were alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the labeling of some of the items contained statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the articles which were false and misleading; (2) in that some of the drugs and merchandise failed to bear labels containing an accurate statement of the quantity of contents of the packages; (3) in that the labels of some of the items did not bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient of the articles; and (4) in that the labeling of some of the items did not bear such adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions wherein their use might be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or duration of administration, in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users.

On September 2, 1942, Dobson and Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the food and drugs which had been seized were ordered released under bond for segregation and destruction of the unfit portion under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

**912. Misbranding of Analgesic Balm. U. S. v. 11¾ Dozen Packages of Analgesic Balm. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to a charitable institution. (F. D. C. No. 6728. Sample No. 74177-E.)**

On January 19, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 11¾ dozen packages of Analgesic Balm at Irvington, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 23 and November 10, 1941, by the Harris Chemical Corporation from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of volatile oils such as methyl salicylate, camphor, and menthol, incorporated in a base composed of a mixture of petroleum derivatives, and lanolin.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use, i. e., the labeling bore no directions for use.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements in the labeling: (Display carton) "Relieves Cold and Rheumatic Pains, Neuralgia, Simple Colds," (retail carton) "For the Relief of \* \* \* Bronchial Irritation," and (tube label) "For the Relief of Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Gout, Headache, etc.," were false and misleading since the product was merely a counter-irritant and would not be capable of producing the effects implied or claimed in the labeling.